

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The present application is directed to claim 1, as claims 2-9 have been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement by the Examiner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 07036061A to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”). In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify its distinguishing features.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection, the Examiner alleges that Aoki, in Figs. 1-3, discloses a liquid crystal device comprising a TFT panel, a counter panel and liquid crystal disposed therein. The Examiner further alleges that Aoki discloses a transparent substrate, a plurality of scanning lines, a plurality of signal lines, a plurality of common lines, an array of pixels and a coupling line, similar to the elements as recited in claim 1.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1 and shown in Fig. 2, teaches a plurality of scanning lines 14 extending in a row direction, a plurality of signal lines extending in a column direction, and a plurality of common lines 16 parallel to the scanning lines 14. Additionally, claim 1 recites an array of pixels at an intersection between one of the scanning lines and one of the signal lines, with the common lines having an extending portion extending outside an area for the array of pixels.

Claim 1 has additionally been amended to add the limitation that the coupling line connects the common lines. The specification, on page 9, lines 10-14, clearly teaches that the coupling line connects the common lines. Therefore, no new matter has been added by way of the amendment to the claim.

Aoki teaches scanning lines 1 in a row direction and signal lines 2 in a vertical direction; however, Aoki teaches in Fig. 1 that the common lines 7 are in a column direction. The present invention clearly shows in Fig. 2, and as recited in claim 1, that the common lines 7 are in a row direction parallel to the scanning lines.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, states that the common lines are described by reference #5. However, Aoki (Abstract) clearly recites that the common lines are reference #7, and that reference #5 are the capacitance lines. Therefore, Aoki fails to teach common lines that are parallel to the scanning lines. Additionally, Aoki fails to teach the common lines being connected by the coupling line, as recited in amended claim 1.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference, disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Lindeman Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458; 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). As Aoki fails to teach the elements of independent claim 1, as discussed above, it is respectfully requested that the §102(b) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn, and that claim 1 be allowed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice

of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


Aasheesh Shravah
Registration No. 54,445

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

AVS:jap